

Space-adiabatic Decoupling to All Orders

Gianluca Panati,^{*} Herbert Spohn,[†] and Stefan Teufel[‡]

Zentrum Mathematik and Physik Department, TU München, D-80290 München, Germany

(Dated: January 28, 2002)

A systematic perturbation scheme is developed for approximate solutions to the time-dependent Schrödinger equation with a space-adiabatic Hamiltonian. For a particular isolated energy band, the basic approach is to separate kinematics from dynamics. The kinematics is defined through a subspace of the full Hilbert space for which transitions to other band subspaces are suppressed to all orders and the dynamics operates in that subspace in terms of an effective intraband Hamiltonian. As novel applications we discuss the Born-Oppenheimer theory to second order and derive the nonperturbative definition of the g -factor of the electron within nonrelativistic quantum electrodynamics.

PACS numbers: 03.65.-w, 03.70.+k

The importance of slow parameter variations is inseparably linked to early quantum mechanics [1] and stood godfather for the time-adiabatic theorem of Born and Fock [2], later rigorized by Kato [3]. The physical idea is simple and best demonstrated in the context of the dynamics of molecules. The nuclei move slowly and follow, within a good approximation, some classical trajectory. The electrons are then subject to a potential of slow time variation. Abstracting from the particular setting, one can think of a time-dependent Hamiltonian $H(t)$ acting on the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$. The slow time-dependence is introduced through $H(\varepsilon t)$, where $\varepsilon \ll 1$ is a dimensionless scale parameter, and one wants to study the solution to the time-dependent Schrödinger equation

$$i\varepsilon \frac{d}{dt} \psi_t = H(t) \psi_t \quad (1)$$

in the limit of small ε . For simplicity $\hbar = 1$, except for the physical examples. In (1) we followed the standard practice to switch to the slow time scale through the substitution t/ε for t . It should only be recalled that t of order 1 corresponds to very long times when measured in atomic units. We assume that $H(t)$ has a physically distinguished “relevant” subspace of dimension m with, only for the sake of presentation, single energy $E(t)$, which is isolated from the rest of the spectrum. The projection $P(t)$ onto the relevant subspace is spanned by the instantaneous eigenvectors $|\varphi_\alpha(t)\rangle$ of $H(t)$ satisfying $H(t)|\varphi_\alpha(t)\rangle = E(t)|\varphi_\alpha(t)\rangle$, $\alpha = 1, \dots, m$. The initial wave function, ψ_0 , is assumed to lie in the relevant subspace, $\psi_0 = P(0)\psi_0$. There is no reason to expect persistence as $\psi_t = P(t)\psi_t$ at later times. The adiabatic theorem asserts however that such a property holds approximately in the sense that

$$\|(1 - P(t))\psi_t\| = \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon) \quad (2)$$

with $\|\psi\| = \langle \psi | \psi \rangle^{1/2}$ the length of the vector ψ .

While the error estimate (2) is undoubtedly correct, it really begs the question, since the nature of $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$ is left unspecified. It could be that a piece of size ε of ψ_t leaks

out into the orthogonal subspace $(1 - P(t))\mathcal{H}$. Alternatively $|\psi_t\rangle\langle\psi_t|$ is slightly tilted relative to $P(t)$. As first recognized by Lenard [4], and on a more refined level in [5, 6, 7, 8], it is the latter option which is realized by the solution to (1). There is then an iterative procedure for constructing a projection $P^\varepsilon(t)$, ε -close to $P(t)$, such that ψ_t remains in $P^\varepsilon(t)\mathcal{H}$ up to any order, in symbols

$$\|(1 - P^\varepsilon(t))\psi_t\| = \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^\infty), \quad \psi_0 = P^\varepsilon(0)\psi_0. \quad (3)$$

The power series for $P^\varepsilon(t)$ is asymptotic, with an error of order $\exp[-1/\varepsilon]$ in case $H(t)$ is analytic in t [9, 10].

Such results are of physical interest only if higher order corrections can be computed in a systematic fashion. We explain a scheme which naturally generalizes to the space-adiabatic decoupling. The idea is to separate kinematics, the subspace $P^\varepsilon(t)\mathcal{H}$, from dynamics, the unitary evolution inside $P^\varepsilon(t)\mathcal{H}$ as generated by some effective Hamiltonian. For this purpose we choose a reference subspace of dimension m with time-independent basis $|\chi_\alpha\rangle$, $\alpha = 1, \dots, m$. The effective Hamiltonian operates in this subspace and to order ε^2 is given by

$$H_{\alpha\beta}^{\text{eff}}(t) = \delta_{\alpha\beta} E(t) - i\varepsilon \langle \varphi_\alpha(t) | \dot{\varphi}_\beta(t) \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon^2 \langle \dot{\varphi}_\alpha(t) | (H(t) - E(t))^{-1} (1 - P(t)) \dot{\varphi}_\beta(t) \rangle + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^3), \quad (4)$$

$\alpha, \beta = 1, \dots, m$. Note that the dynamical problem (1) has been reduced to the dimension of the relevant subspace. Secondly there is a unitary, $U^\varepsilon(t)$, which rotates the reference subspace into $P^\varepsilon(t)\mathcal{H}$. To order ε one finds

$$U^\varepsilon(t) = \sum_{\alpha=1}^m \left(|\varphi_\alpha(t)\rangle + i\varepsilon (H(t) - E(t))^{-1} (1 - P(t)) |\dot{\varphi}_\alpha(t)\rangle \right) \langle \chi_\alpha | + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^2). \quad (5)$$

Thus, if $\chi^\varepsilon(t)$ denotes the time-evolved vector in the reference subspace, i.e. the solution to $i\varepsilon d\chi^\varepsilon(t)/dt = H^{\text{eff}}(t)\chi^\varepsilon(t)$, $\chi^\varepsilon(0) = \chi$, then the $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^\infty)$ -approximate solution to (1) reads

$$\psi_t = U^\varepsilon(t)\chi^\varepsilon(t), \quad \psi_0 = U^\varepsilon(0)\chi, \quad (6)$$

which is valid on the slow time scale with an error $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^2)$ upon inserting (4) and (5).

Physically, the separation into prescribed slow degrees of freedom and rapidly adjusting fast degrees of freedom is somewhat artificial. In actual fact there is a single time-independent Hamiltonian governing all degrees of freedom. For example, the molecular Hamiltonian is independent of time and the separation into slow nuclei and fast electrons results from the small mass ratio. What is then needed is a *spatial* version of the time-adiabatic theorem in the sense that some dynamical degrees of freedom are frozen out. While the physical mechanism behind such a space-adiabatic decoupling may differ widely, our discovery is that there is a unifying and general theoretical framework. We like to compare the situation with standard bound state perturbation theory. It is always the same algebra, but the physical manifestations are rich and differ widely depending on the context. The general scheme to be sketched below is applicable to a variety of systems such as the Dirac equation with slowly varying external fields, the Born-Oppenheimer Hamiltonian, electron motion in periodic potentials, magnetic Bloch bands, motion on embedded manifolds with constraining transverse potential, and others. These systems have been studied before by model dependent methods and it is not uncommon to have a debate as regards to the structure of second order corrections [11, 12, 13, 14, 15]. In contrast our perturbation scheme systematically computes higher order corrections and provides error bounds. Such a scheme was envisioned by E. I. Blount in a remarkable series of papers [16, 17, 18]. Particular aspects are studied by Littlejohn and Flynn [19, 20] and Nenciu and Sordani [21]. The full justification of the space-adiabatic perturbation theory is beyond the size of a letter and given elsewhere [22]. Here we merely explain the structure of the leading order terms. As novel applications we discuss the second order Born-Oppenheimer theory and derive the gyromagnetic ratio (*g*-factor) for an electron coupled to the quantized radiation field within nonrelativistic quantum electrodynamics.

We claim that the spatial version of Eq. (1) reads

$$i\varepsilon \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \psi_t = H(\hat{q}, \varepsilon \hat{p}) \psi_t. \quad (7)$$

$q \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is a position like variable and p the corresponding canonical momentum. Again, $\varepsilon \ll 1$ is a dimensionless scale parameter, which controls the variation of q and p . The phase space for the slow degrees of freedom is $\Gamma = \mathbb{R}^{2d}$. $H(q, p)$ is an operator valued function on Γ , which acts on the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_f$ of “internal” degrees of freedom, and $\hat{q} = x, \hat{p} = -i\nabla_x$. To properly define $H(\hat{q}, \varepsilon \hat{p})$ we adopt the Weyl rule for operator ordering,

$$H(\hat{q}, \varepsilon \hat{p}) \psi(x) = (2\pi)^{-d} \int d^d x' d^d \xi e^{i(x-x') \cdot \xi} \times H(\tfrac{1}{2}(x+x'), \varepsilon \xi) \psi(x'), \quad (8)$$

where H acts as an operator on ψ . The “spinor” wave function $\psi(x)$ takes values in $\mathcal{H}_f$. Thus the Hilbert space for the Schrödinger equation (7) is $\mathcal{H} = L^2(\mathbb{R}^d, \mathcal{H}_f) = L^2(\mathbb{R}^d) \otimes \mathcal{H}_f$.

The eigenvalues of the Hamiltonian $H(q, p)$ define the energy bands. One of them, or one group of them, is considered to be physically relevant and, only for the sake of simplified presentation, is assumed to consist of a single band energy $E(q, p)$ of constant multiplicity m . Thus there are m orthogonal eigenvectors satisfying $H(q, p)|\psi_\alpha(q, p)\rangle = E(q, p)|\psi_\alpha(q, p)\rangle$. They span the projector $P(q, p) = \sum_{\alpha=1}^m |\psi_\alpha(q, p)\rangle \langle \psi_\alpha(q, p)|$. As crucial assumption one needs that for each q, p the energy $E(q, p)$ is separated by a gap from the remainder of the spectrum of $H(q, p)$. In spirit, to lowest order in ε , the projector onto the adiabatically decoupled subspace of $\mathcal{H}$ is the Weyl quantization $P(\hat{q}, \varepsilon \hat{p})$. However, $P(\hat{q}, \varepsilon \hat{p})$ is not a projector, in general. Still on abstract grounds one can construct a time-independent subspace $P^\varepsilon \mathcal{H}$, the projection P^ε being ε -close to $P(\hat{q}, \varepsilon \hat{p})$, which is adiabatically decoupled to all orders in ε , in the sense that

$$\|(1 - P^\varepsilon) \psi_t\| = \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^\infty), \quad \psi_0 = P^\varepsilon \psi_0, \quad (9)$$

for ψ_t the solution to (7), compare with (3).

To systematically compute approximate solutions we disentangle kinematics and dynamics. The reference Hilbert space is now $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d) \otimes \mathbb{C}^m$ with fixed spinor basis $|\chi_\alpha\rangle, \alpha = 1, \dots, m$. The effective Hamiltonian to order ε turns out to be the Weyl quantization of

$$H_{\alpha\beta}^{\text{eff}}(q, p) = \delta_{\alpha\beta} E(q, p) - \tfrac{1}{2} i \varepsilon \langle \psi_\alpha(q, p) | \{H(q, p) + E(q, p), \psi_\beta(q, p)\} \rangle + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^2). \quad (10)$$

$\{\cdot, \cdot\}$ is the Poisson bracket defined for the operator- resp. vector-valued functions A, ψ as $\{A, \psi\} = \nabla_p A \cdot \nabla_q \psi - \nabla_q A \cdot \nabla_p \psi$. The reference subspace is rotated by the unitary U^ε into the adiabatically decoupled subspace $P^\varepsilon \mathcal{H}$. To lowest order one obtains the Weyl quantization of

$$U_0(q, p) = \sum_{\alpha=1}^m |\psi_\alpha(q, p)\rangle \langle \chi_\alpha|. \quad (11)$$

$U_0(\hat{q}, \varepsilon \hat{p})$ is not unitary in general, but the error is in higher orders. As in the time-adiabatic setting the approximate solution to the Schrödinger equation (7) is given by

$$\psi_t = U^\varepsilon(\hat{q}, \varepsilon \hat{p}) \exp[-iH^{\text{eff}}(\hat{q}, \varepsilon \hat{p})t/\varepsilon] \chi_0 + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^\infty), \quad (12)$$

where $\psi_0 = U^\varepsilon(\hat{q}, \varepsilon \hat{p}) \chi_0$. Inserting from (10) and (11), the solution holds on the slow time scale with an error $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$.

Higher order corrections to (10), (11) are available [22], but they rapidly increase in complexity. To provide some idea we explain the second order Born-Oppenheimer approximation, for which the Hamiltonian has the form

$$H_{\text{BO}}(q, p) = \tfrac{1}{2} p^2 \mathbf{1} + V(q), \quad (13)$$

where $\mathbf{1}$ is the unit operator and $V(q)$ is some operator both acting on $\mathcal{H}_f$. For a molecule, q would stand for the coordinates of the nuclei and $V(q)$ is the electronic Hamiltonian with the nuclei fixed at q . The adiabaticity parameter is $\varepsilon = (m_{\text{el}}/m_{\text{nuc}})^{1/2}$, assuming that the nuclei have all the same mass, and $H_{\text{BO}}(\hat{q}, \varepsilon\hat{p}) = -\varepsilon^2\Delta/2 + V(x)$ is the standard molecular Hamiltonian. The relevant subspace is spanned by eigenvectors to $V(q)$, $V(q)|\psi_\alpha(q)\rangle = e(q)|\psi_\alpha(q)\rangle$, $\alpha = 1, \dots, m$. Thus $E(q, p) = \frac{1}{2}p^2 + e(q)$ and $P(q, p)$ depends only on q as $P(q) = \sum_{\alpha=1}^m |\psi_\alpha(q)\rangle\langle\psi_\alpha(q)|$, which implies that also $P(\hat{q})$ is a projector without additional corrections from the operator ordering. Generalizing [11, 23], the effective Hamiltonian including second order is computed to

$$H_{\text{BO}\alpha\beta}^{\text{eff}}(q, p) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\gamma=1}^m (p\delta_{\alpha\gamma} - \varepsilon A_{\alpha\gamma}(q)) \cdot (p\delta_{\gamma\beta} - \varepsilon A_{\gamma\beta}(q)) \\ + e(q)\delta_{\alpha\beta} + \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon^2 \langle \nabla\psi_\alpha(q) | \cdot \nabla\psi_\beta(q) \rangle \\ - \varepsilon^2 \langle p \cdot \nabla\psi_\alpha(q) | (V(q) - e(q))^{-1} (1 - P(q)) p \cdot \nabla\psi_\beta(q) \rangle \\ + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^3), \quad (14)$$

where the “vector potential” of the Berry connection reads $A_{\alpha\beta}(q) = i\langle\psi_\alpha(q)|\nabla\psi_\beta(q)\rangle$. As before, the effective quantum Hamiltonian to that order is the Weyl quantization $H_{\text{BO}}^{\text{eff}}(\hat{q}, \varepsilon\hat{p})$. For the unitary, which rotates the reference space back to $P^\varepsilon\mathcal{H}$, one obtains

$$U_{\text{BO}}(q, p) = \sum_{\alpha=1}^m \left(|\psi_\alpha(q)\rangle + i\varepsilon(V(q) - e(q))^{-1} \right. \\ \left. \times (1 - P(q)) |p \cdot \nabla\psi_\alpha(q)\rangle \right) \langle \chi_\alpha | + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^2). \quad (15)$$

Note the similarity with the time-adiabatic approximation (4), (5).

We skipped over the issue on which time scale (12) is valid. Clearly, there are two different ways of reading our result. Either one considers the time scale $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^0)$ on which (7) is written. Then, inserting (14) and (15), the error in (12) is $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^2)$. Or one considers the longer time scale $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^{-1})$. Then precision is lost and the error is guaranteed to be $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$ only. Note that in this second variant the adiabatic decoupling time is much longer than the one which would result from a semiclassical analysis of the Hamiltonian $H_{\text{BO}}^{\text{eff}}(\hat{q}, \varepsilon\hat{p})$. Its validity is restricted to the Ehrenfest time which usually is of order $\log \varepsilon^{-1}$ in our units.

To have a concrete physical example we discuss the gyromagnetic ratio of the electron in nonrelativistic QED. The electron is subject to a weak uniform external magnetic field. The internal degrees of freedom are the photons which rapidly adjust to a state of lowest energy consistent with the momentary state of the electron. The orbital motion is circular with frequency ω_c and the spin motion is precession with frequency ω_s . As the standard definition of the g -factor we adopt

$$g = 2\omega_s/\omega_c. \quad (16)$$

To apply our general scheme it is convenient to consider first the motion in arbitrary external potentials of slow variation. The g -factor will be retrieved as a special case. In dimensionless Heaviside–Lorentz units the Hamiltonian with zero external potentials reads

$$H = (1/2)(\sigma \cdot (p_{\text{el}} - eA_\varphi(x)))^2 + H_f, \quad (17)$$

$\alpha = e^2/4\pi$ the fine-structure constant [24]. x, p_{el} are position and momentum of the electron, σ is the vector of the Pauli matrices, $H_f = \sum_{\lambda=1,2} \int d^3k |k| a^\dagger(k, \lambda) a(k, \lambda)$ is the energy of the photons with dispersion $\omega(k) = |k|$ and helicity λ , and $A_\varphi(x)$ is the quantized transverse vector potential, which is smeared with the form factor φ (=ultraviolet cutoff). The dressed electron responds to the slowly varying external potentials $\phi_{\text{ex}}(\varepsilon x)$, $A_{\text{ex}}(\varepsilon x)$ through a slow variation of the total momentum $p = p_{\text{el}} + P_f$, where $P_f = \sum_{\lambda=1,2} \int d^3k k a^\dagger(k, \lambda) a(k, \lambda)$ is the momentum of the photons. To write the Hamiltonian in the standard space-adiabatic form (7) one thus has to substitute $p - P_f$ for p_{el} and x/ε for x in order to arrive at the operator valued function

$$H(q, p) = \frac{1}{2}(p - P_f - eA_\varphi - eA_{\text{ex}}(q))^2 \\ - \frac{1}{2}e(B_\varphi + \varepsilon B_{\text{ex}}(q)) \cdot \sigma + e\phi_{\text{ex}}(q) + H_f \quad (18)$$

with the abbreviations $A_\varphi = A_\varphi(0)$, $B_\varphi = \nabla \times A_\varphi(0)$, $B_{\text{ex}}(q) = \nabla \times A_{\text{ex}}(q)$. The Weyl quantization of (18) is the Hamiltonian of nonrelativistic QED. $H(q, p)$ acts on the electron spinor and the wave function for the photons. Thus $\mathcal{H}_f = \mathbb{C}^2 \otimes \mathcal{F}$ with $\mathcal{F}$ the photon Fock space. Note that $H(q, p)$ has a rather particular structure which we abbreviate as

$$H(q, p) = D(\tilde{p}) - \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon e B_{\text{ex}}(q) \cdot \sigma + e\phi_{\text{ex}}(q), \quad (19)$$

where $\tilde{p} = p - eA_{\text{ex}}(q)$ is the kinetic momentum.

The physically relevant subspace is spanned by the eigenvectors of lowest energy. They satisfy $D(\tilde{p})|\psi_\alpha(\tilde{p})\rangle = E_0(\tilde{p})|\psi_\alpha(\tilde{p})\rangle$, which implies $E(q, p) = E_0(p - eA_{\text{ex}}(q)) + e\phi_{\text{ex}}(q)$. By spin degeneracy the ground state subspace turns out to have dimension 2, i.e. $m = 2, \alpha = \pm 1$ [25]. In addition, $E_0(p)$ is isolated from the rest of the spectrum for $|p|$ smaller than Compton momentum, provided the interaction is cut off in the infrared. We want to fix a basis such that ψ_+ corresponds to the electron spin pointing along the $+z$ direction. For this purpose one notes that the total angular momentum J in the direction of p is conserved, $[D(p), p \cdot J] = 0$. Thus the eigenvectors along $\pm p$ are uniquely fixed and by suitable linear combination therefore also along $\pm z$.

At this stage one merely inserts in (10). The effective Hamiltonian including first order is computed to

$$H_{\alpha\beta}^{\text{eff}}(q, p) = \left(E_0(p - eA_{\text{ex}}(q)) + e\phi_{\text{ex}}(q) \right) \delta_{\alpha\beta} \\ - \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon e B_{\text{ex}}(q) \cdot \langle \psi_\alpha(\tilde{p}) | \sigma \psi_\beta(\tilde{p}) \rangle$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& -\varepsilon e \left(-\nabla \phi_{\text{ex}}(q) + v \times B_{\text{ex}}(q) \right) \cdot \langle \psi_{\alpha}(\tilde{p}) | i \nabla \psi_{\beta}(\tilde{p}) \rangle \\
& -\frac{1}{2} i \varepsilon e B_{\text{ex}}(q) \cdot \langle \nabla \psi_{\alpha}(\tilde{p}) | \times (D(\tilde{p}) - E_0(\tilde{p})) \nabla \psi_{\beta}(\tilde{p}) \rangle \\
& + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^2) \\
& = H_{0\alpha\beta}^{\text{eff}}(q, p) + \varepsilon H_{1\alpha\beta}^{\text{eff}}(q, p) + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^2), \tag{20}
\end{aligned}$$

where $\langle \cdot | \cdot \rangle$ is the scalar product in $\mathbb{C}^2 \otimes \mathcal{F}$, $\tilde{p} = p - eA_{\text{ex}}(q)$ as before, $v = \nabla E_0(\tilde{p})$. Upon Weyl quantization H_0^{eff} is the Peierls substitution. H_1^{eff} describes the spin precession. The effective Hamiltonian (20) is most conveniently studied through semiclassical methods [22]. The center q_t, p_t of the wave packet is governed by the classical Hamiltonian $E_0(p - eA_{\text{ex}}(q)) + e\phi_{\text{ex}}(q)$. With our choice of time scale, q_t, p_t no longer depend on ε . Inserting a particular orbit q_t, p_t in H_1^{eff} and cancelling the ε -factors in (7) and (20) yields the spin precession as

$$i \frac{d}{dt} \chi_t = H_1^{\text{eff}}(q_t, p_t) \chi_t. \tag{21}$$

Orbital motion and spin precession vary on the same time scale and the spin does not react back on the orbit to our order.

Of particular interest is a uniform external magnetic field, $B_{\text{ex}}(q) = B$, $\phi_{\text{ex}}(q) = 0$, and small velocities $v = \nabla E_0(\tilde{p})$, which means $\tilde{p}_t = 0$ in good approximation. Let us introduce the bare mass m of the electron, the velocity of light c , and Planck's constant $\hbar$. Then the spin Hamiltonian becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
H_{\alpha\beta}^{\text{spin}} &= -\frac{e\hbar}{2m} B \cdot \left(\langle \psi_{\alpha}(0) | \sigma \psi_{\beta}(0) \rangle \right. \\
&\quad \left. + i \langle \nabla \psi_{\alpha}(0) | \times (D(0) - E(0)) \nabla \psi_{\beta}(0) \rangle \right) = \frac{1}{2} \hbar \mu (B \cdot \sigma)_{\alpha\beta}
\end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

which implicitly defines the frequency $\omega_s = \mu|B|$ of the spin precession. On the other hand the orbital motion is

$$m_{\text{eff}} \ddot{q} = \frac{e}{c} \dot{q} \times B, \quad m_{\text{eff}} = 1/E_0''(0), \tag{23}$$

which yields the cyclotron frequency $\omega_c = e|B|/m_{\text{eff}}c$. Together with the definition (16) one deduces the non-perturbative expression of the g -factor valid for any value of the fine structure constant.

The matrix elements in (22) and for $E_0''(0)$ are not available as closed formulae. The only possibility is to expand in e around $e = 0$. To second order in e and removing the ultraviolet cutoff one obtains

$$g = 2 \left(1 + \frac{8}{3} \left(\frac{\alpha}{2\pi} \right) + \mathcal{O}(\alpha^2) \right) \tag{24}$$

in agreement with [26], who use static second order perturbation for the Zeeman splitting.

In summary, the expressions (10) and (11) and their higher order corrections provide a systematic approximation in space-adiabatic situations. To compute them one

needs as explicit as possible the eigenbasis in the relevant subspace. Just like in static perturbation theory for eigenvalues at second order, also here the inverse operator $(H(q, p) - E(q, p))^{-1}$ appears, compare with (14), (15), which is not necessarily readily available. From our own experience approximations beyond second order become tedious and most likely carry no additional physical insights.

* Also at Math. Phys. Sector, SISSA, Trieste; Electronic address: panati@sissa.it

† Electronic address: spohn@ma.tum.de

‡ Electronic address: teufel@ma.tum.de

- [1] P. Ehrenfest, Ann. Physik **51**, 327 (1916).
- [2] M. Born, V. Fock, Z. Physik **51**, 165 (1928).
- [3] T. Kato, Phys. Soc. Jap. **5**, 435 (1958).
- [4] A. Lenard, Ann. Phys. **6**, 261 (1959).
- [5] J. Avron, R. Seiler, L.G. Yaffe, Comm. Math. Phys. **110**, 33 (1987).
- [6] M. Berry, in: *Geometric Phases in Physics*, eds. A. Shapere, F. Wilczek (World Scientific, Singapore, 1989), p.7.
- [7] A. Joye, H. Kunz, C. Pfister, Ann. Phys. **208**, 299 (1991).
- [8] G. Nenciu, Comm. Math. Phys. **152**, 479 (1993).
- [9] A. Joye, C. Pfister, in: *On Three Levels*, edited by M. Fannes, C. Maes, A. Verbeure (Plenum Press, New York, 1994), p.139.
- [10] A. Joye, C. Pfister, J. Math. Phys. **34**, 454 (1993).
- [11] R.G. Littlejohn, S. Weigert, Phys. Rev. A **48**, 924 (1993).
- [12] Y. Aharonov, A. Stern, Phys. Rev. Lett. **69**, 3593 (1992).
- [13] M.C. Chang, Q. Niu, Phys. Rev. Lett. **75**, 1348 (1995).
- [14] M.C. Chang, Q. Niu, Phys. Rev. B **53**, 7010 (1996).
- [15] K. Heinemann, D.P. Barber, arxiv-physics/9901044, (1999).
- [16] E.I. Blount, Formalism of Band Theory. In: *Solid State Physics, Advances in Research and Applications*, eds. F. Seitz, D. Turnbull, **13**, 305-372 (1962).
- [17] E.I. Blount, Phys. Rev. **126**, 1636-1653 (1962).
- [18] E.I. Blount, Phys. Rev. **128**, 2454-2458 (1962).
- [19] R.G. Littlejohn, W.G. Flynn, Phys. Rev. Lett. **66**, 2839 (1991).
- [20] R.G. Littlejohn, W.G. Flynn, Phys. Rev. A **44**, 5239 (1991).
- [21] G. Nenciu, V. Sordani, mp_arc 01-36 (2001).
- [22] G. Panati, H. Spohn, S. Teufel, Space-adiabatic perturbation theory, mp_arc 02-34 and math-ph/0201055.
- [23] S. Weigert, R.G. Littlejohn, Phys. Rev. A **47**, 3506 (1993).
- [24] P.W. Milonni, *The Quantum Vacuum*. (Academic Press, New York, 1994).
- [25] F. Hiroshima, H. Spohn, mp-arc 01-407 (2001).
- [26] H. Grotch, E. Kazes, Am. J. Phys. **45**, 618 (1977).